

REMARKS

By the present amendment, Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 8. Claims 1-13 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 8 are independent claims.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative during the personal interview held February 28, 2005. The present response summarizes the substance of the interview. At the interview the claims and prior art were discussed, and a model was exhibited. Arguments were advanced that structures taught by the prior art did not relieve the load imposed on the retaining pins. The retaining pins shown in each of the prior art references bore the braking load because the pins are positioned to hold the rotor and the hub such that when braking, the load would be transferred from the rotor to the retaining pins to the hub. Whether the pins are disposed in a recess, or a clevis, the load is transferred through the retaining pins. The claims of the instant application set forth that the engaging wall surfaces of the rotor protrusions, and the hub recesses bear the braking load forces, bypassing the retaining pins. Applicant's representative exhibited a model showing how the load bearing surfaces bypass the retaining pins during braking. The Examiner indicated that he would reconsider the application in light of the discussion and model upon the filing of a formal response to the outstanding Office Action.

Interview
Record of
OK
PB
4/29/05